

1. *Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.

Whig measure, how can men, professing to be Democrats, object to Col. Folk, because he is opposed to it? Why are both unaided? "I cannot assist." If Col. Folk had responded to the interrogatories of the Dickinson meeting in the spirit of friendship for the Act of 1842 that Mr. Clay has done, what would have been the result? Why, most unquestionably, his abandonment by almost the entire National Democratic party — He could not have stood a day as the leader and champion of Democracy, after endorsing the most unjust and oppressive act of the White Congress of 1842. He could no longer have stood a day as a Democrat — and, after the repeated ex-

days of opinion against that Act which he has given, which were well known to the Nation. Considered from whom he received his nomination, and to the people to whose support the body recommended him, a sudden change from hostility to friendship for the act of 1812 may have lost him the respect, as well as the support of the Democratic party from Maine to Georgia. He would have been looked upon as a change-lag—as a man of weak mind, or corrupt principles—as an ambitious aspirant, who was willing to make any sacrifice for the sake of office; and the ruined reputation which he had acquired only through the toil and sacrifices of years would have been blasted in a moment and for ever.

Wasn't the common opinion of the Dickinsons' friends to reduce the number of their papers? We have a better opinion of them than to believe so. Why, then, did they persist in their error? The answer is plain: they acted under the influence of wrong impressions. They started out with the idea that the tariff of 1832 was a democratic measure, and that "protection" was a democratic principle. And how came they to labor under this strange delusion? Need any man ask the question? Why, tens of thousands of the likeliest denizens of Pennsylvania are at this moment cherishing this same fallacy—and when they conceive that it is a fallacy, they are convinced that Daniel K. Fols is opposed to the doctrine of "protection," like the men of Dickinson, they will desert him, because the

have been led to believe that "protection" is a democratic doctrine, and they will regard Polk's aversity to protection as an abandonment of democratic principles. This is one of the most blasting results of the decepted and fraudulent course pursued by the so-called Democratic press in this Commonwealth; it is one of the poisonous fruits of that system of SOPHISTRY and FALSEHOOD which, without a single exception that we know of, has been resorted to by the travelling rogues and lawless and ignorant whippers-in of the party. Instead of honestly avowing the fraud and lying principles of the party, showing their superiority over those of their opponents, and preparing the minds of the people to receive them,

—LIKE BASH, CLEVELAND, and many other authors have thus far opposed the campaign in favor of securing the right of suffrage to the negro by enacting their own democratic statute. This has a false issue been presented to democracy, by men in whom they trust and whom we prize principally for evidence of generous bestowal, should have honest and faithful to the trust. "Time and again we have protested against the anti-democratic course pursued by the press, orators, and leaders of the democratic party." We have admitted them of the weakness of their policy, the dangers of their course. We have condemned the wickedness of the frauds they were practicing, and moved them to return to

paths of truth and sobriety. But our members and our administration have been told by hot, presumptuous demagogues—and men who have scarcely emerged from the swaddling cloth of democracy, have presumed to take issue with us on the errors and impudency of our institutions. . . . Everywhere else the party candidate has been unanimously supported on party principles . . . whereas this has been a trifling and intelligible detour from the cause of temperance." But in Pennsylvania, where the *first issue was made*, and Col Fols held up to the people, AGAIN, TRUTH AND HISTORY, as the example, *Protection and the Friend of the Temperance*, the functions are already taking place, and, in fact, unless Whig principles are speedily abandoned,

the same, and the same doctrine is  
universally attributed to the party  
described, and the same doctrine  
is now, and has been for many  
years, the doctrine of the  
Democratic Party in Pennsylvania.  
It is not, as the Democrats  
asserted by their party, a doctrine  
shared by itself, but a small affair—and it  
will not be without effect. *It may be the*  
*policy of many such movements—and the end*  
*may be disastrous, that we imagine. When*  
*the people have been deceived in regard to*  
*true sentiments at Gox Park and the true*  
*action of the Democratic party, we must ex-*  
*pect the momentary light thrown upon their*  
*imposition is exposed. Such being the*  
*case to be apprehended, we again appeal to*  
*the Democracy of Pennsylvania, to the democ-*  
*eratic men of this State, to meet at once the*

In connection with this matter, and to the light in which the land of 1842 is viewed, the democracy of other parties, we commend the attention of our democratic readers to a few extracts from speeches recently delivered at New York, Cambridge and Benning, N. H., by the great Democratic orator, Wm. L. Chapin, at the Great Democratic meeting, held at the Essex Garden, New York, on the 10th of June, 1842, and at Benning, N. H., on the 11th of the same month, speaking of the Whig Tariff of 1842, said—

"Now we have a revenue more than double

that which is necessary for the purposes of Government. This year the Tariff has yielded thirty-five millions, eleven millions of which are sent to the States. Suppose the Tariff is not repealed, will that then deprive millions of people among the States, to convert them, or in support of over trading, such as existed in 1857 and 1858? It must be so. The cause will always produce the same effect. Mr. Wigglesworth remarked:

The question of the Tariff has been so often and so frequently discussed, that I feel that I am not occupying your time at present on this subject. It is a subject I am sure, however,

of protection of preference with any measure and will be the two nations instead of one. This is the wrong protective policy, is not carry him to the edge, up to to this. Why should we raise



